

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-12, 15-81 and 22 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of August 19, 2008 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 3 and 22 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Oath/Declaration

Independent claim 3 is amended to recite that the extended auxiliary capacitance line is formed from a layer of the signal line, and a connecting part is formed in such a manner as to have a largest area neighboring the display area to obtain a small value contact resistance, and to prevent the common signal from delaying. The declaration provides a graph in which the horizontal axis of the graph shows the region where the contact can be established, and where transforming is attained in the neighborhood of the displaying part, the region of the horizontal axis becomes wide, and thereby the contact resistance between the auxiliary capacitance line and the collected auxiliary capacitance line is reduced to the level of several tens ohm. Accordingly, the amendments to claim 3 clarify the limitations of claim 3 so that they are commensurate in scope with the object evidence provided by the declaration.

Likewise, claim 1 is amended to recite that the connecting part is formed in such a manner as to have a largest area neighboring the display area, and to maintain the connecting with the scanning line adjacent to the connecting part. Therefore, claim 1 is amended to also be commensurate in scope with the declaration, since the declaration that where transforming is attained in the neighborhood of the display part the region in the horizontal axis becomes wide, i.e. the region where the contact can be established has the largest area neighboring the display area. As a result, the unexpected result of reducing the contact resistance is obtained, as shown in the graph included with the declaration.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-12, 15-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Dohjo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,366) in view of Sakata et al. (JP 11-284195). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not

disclosed or suggested by the cited references, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite a connecting part for connecting the scanning line with the extended scanning line by the pixel electrodes, wherein the connecting part is formed in such a manner as to have a largest area neighboring the display area, and to maintain the connecting with the scanning line adjacent to the connecting part. Applicant respectfully submits that least this limitation is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Neither of the cited references make any mentioned of forming a connecting part in such a manner as to have a largest area neighboring the display area, and to maintain the connecting with the scanning line adjacent to the connecting part, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, for the reasons discussed above with respect to the Oath/Declaration, since the limitations recited in claim 1 produce unexpected results as discussed in the declaration, it would not be an obvious modification or combination of the cited references to arrive at the claimed limitations. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claims 3 and 22 are amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and therefore for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 19 December 2008



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955